REMARKS

In order to make out a *prima facie* rejection, an office action must establish that the prior art teaches how to do something and why to do something. It is respectfully submitted that the Ohashi reference is merely cited to indicate that it is possible to do what is claimed and not to indicate any rationale to do what is claimed. Thus, on its face, the rejection including Ohashi is insufficient. Moreover, the Ohashi reference does not teach how to do what is claimed.

Ohashi teaches that two pages of images may be downloaded in one connection session. But the claim calls for "automatically transferring information to a wireless device at a predetermined time, from two or more web sites in a single connection session." Thus, the cited reference does not tell how to do what is claimed, namely, automatically transferring information, automatically transferring information to a wireless device, automatically doing it at a predetermined time, and automatically doing it from two or more web sites in a single connection. In sum, the cited reference does not even teach how to do what is claimed and does not even teach how to do what is plainly missing in the other cited reference.

Moreover, a teaching that one could transmit two pages of information in one connection session provides absolutely no rationale for why to modify Khan to meet the limitations set forth above in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 and the other pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>May 12, 2005</u>

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation